REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated January 13, 2005. Claims 1-25 are now present in this case. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 17, and 19 are amended. New claims 25-31 have been added.

The Examiner will kindly note that representation in this matter has been transferred to another attorney. A Power of Attorney to Prosecute Application Before the USPTO, a Statement Under 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b), and a Request to Amend the Attorney Docket Number are enclosed herewith.

Claims 3, 11, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and indefinite. The applicants have amended these claims to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,888 to Jonsson et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. Specifically, Jonsson discloses a process by which a header is extracted from a data stream and portions of the extracted header are processed. The header, including the processed portions of the header are recombined with a payload for subsequent transmission. However, it should be noted that Jonsson does not teach or suggest that portions of the extracted header be discarded. Indeed, Jonsson teaches directly away from the rejected claims by stating that the integrity of header fields is violated "in a manner that is transparent to the header compression scheme and that does not disturb the functionality of the header field." (See column 2, lines 34-37.) Jonsson describes a technique by which certain header fields may be processed by filtering. However, all header fields, including the processed header fields are recombined with the payload for transmission to a remote unit.

In sharp contrast to Jonsson, claim 1 recites *inter alia* "a header compressor configured to compress relevant portions of the extracted header and to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header." Jonsson does not teach or suggest discarding irrelevant portions of the extracted header. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly allowable over Jonsson. Claim 5 is also allowable in view of the fact that it depends from claim 1, and further in view of the recitation within the claim.

Claim 9 is a method claim and recites *inter alia* "compressing relevant portions of the extracted header and discarding irrelevant portions of the extracted header." As noted above, Jonsson processes selected header portions, but does not teach or suggest discarding irrelevant portions of the header. Accordingly, claim 9 is clearly allowable over Jonsson. Claim 13 is also allowable in view of the fact that it depends from claim 9, and further in view of the recitation within the claim.

Claim 17 is a machine-readable medium claim containing the plurality of instructions that *inter alia* "compress relevant portions of the extracted header" as well as "discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header." As noted above, Jonsson does not teach or suggest discarding irrelevant portions of the extracted header. Accordingly, claim 17 is clearly allowable over Jonsson. Claim 21 is also allowable in view of the fact that it depends from claim 17, and further in view of the recitation within the claim.

Claims 2-4, 10-12, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jonsson combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,832,088 to Stumpert. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. The combination of references do not teach or suggest discarding irrelevant portions of an extracted header, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action states, on page 6, that Stumpert discloses header fields that are not transmitted with the payload. This is a mischaracterization of Stumpert, which describes a process in which call control communications and bearer control communications may be transmitted over separate routes to more efficiently permit call setup. However, Stumpert does not teach or suggest that header information on the bearer channel not be transmitted with the payload. Furthermore, the combination of Jonsson and Stumpert do not suggest a header compressor that is configured "to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header field," as recited in, by way of example, claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 are clearly allowable over Jonsson and Stumpert.

The combination of Jonnson and Stumpert do not teach or suggest a method that recites "discarding irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 and dependent claims 10-12 are clearly allowable over the combination of Johnson and Stumpert.

The combination of Jonnson and Stumpert do not suggest a machine-readable medium comprising instructions to "discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 and dependent claims 18-20 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonnson and Stumpert.

Claims 6, 14-16, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Jonnson and an article by Hsing Mei. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. The irrelevance of Jonsson has already been discussed extensively above. Mei describes techniques for converting an HTTP proxy server into a wireless Internet gateway. However, the combination of references do not suggest a call context processor that is configured "to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claim 6 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Mei.

The combination of Jonsson and Mei do not suggest a method that recites "discarding irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 and dependent claims 14-16 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Mei.

The combination of Jonsson and Mei do not suggest a machine-readable medium comprising instructions to "discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 and dependent claims 22-24 are clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson and Mei.

Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,012 to Ton combined with Jonsson. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. Ton is cited in the Office Action as teaching a transmission network. The Office Action correctly concedes that Ton does not teach a call context processor, but cites Jonnson for disclosing such a processor. However, as discussed above, Jonnson does not teach or suggest a call context processor that comprises a header compressor configured "to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header," as recited in claim 7. The combination of Ton and Johnson do not teach or suggest such a transmission network. Accordingly, claim 7 is

clearly allowable over the combination of Ton and Jonsson. Claim 8 is allowable is view of the fact that it depends from 7, and further in view of the recitation within the claim.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,
Alok K. Saxena et al.
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Michael J. Donohue
Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc

Enclosures:
Power of Attorney
Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b)

2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1622262_1.DOC